

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed August 22, 2007.

It was noted that Applicant's argument, "references submitted in Supplemental Information Disclosure Statements dated July 22, 2004 and July 23, 2004", appears to be in error. Applicant submits that the statement was meant to refer to Information Disclosure Statements submitted June 22, 2004 and June 23, 2004 which were received by the Office June 24, 2004 and June 30, 2004 respectively. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration of the former on June 24, 2004 and the latter on March 3, 2006.

Claims **55** and **64** were objected to because of informalities.

Claims **21**, **28**, **30**, **31** and **35** were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Lauf et al. (US patent 5,969,639).

Claims **22**, **24**, **25**, **27**, **32** and **33** were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauf and further in view of Smesny et al (US Patent 5,444,637).

Claims **23**, **29** and **34** were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauf and further in view of Schwarz et al. (US patent 5,669,713).

Claim **36** was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauf and further in view of Renken et al. (US patent 6,190,040).

Claims **45**, **46** and **55-69** were allowed.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

To Expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended claim **21** to specify that the leads are sufficiently flexible to allow relative movement of the electronics module and/or substrate between at least a first position and a second position, wherein in the first position the electronics module is above or below the substrate, and in the second position the electronics module and the substrate are displaced from each other such that the first and second perimeters do not intersect. Support for this feature may be found in the specification as filed, e.g., at FIG. 1A, FIG. 1B, paragraphs 0026, 0029 and original claim **45**. As such, no new matter has been entered with this amendment.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

To expedite prosecution, the Applicants have amended claims **55** and **64** as recommended by the Examiner.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 USC 103(a)

Claims **21**, **28**, **30**, **31** and **35** were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Lauf et al. (US patent 5,969,639).

Claims **22**, **24**, **25**, **27**, **32** and **33** were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauf and further in view of Smesny et al (US Patent 5,444,637).

Claims **23**, **29** and **34** were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauf and further in view of Schwarz et al. (US patent 5,669,713).

Claim **36** was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauf and further in view of Renken et al. (US patent 6,190,040).

Applicant submits that the amendment to claim **21** incorporates subject matter regarding relative movement of the substrate and electronics module that is similar to that found in allowed claims **45** and **55**. As such, claims **21** is believed to be allowable over the prior art of record and claims **22-36** are believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence from claim **21**.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in claims **45**, **46** and **55-69**.

CONCLUSION:

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicants submit that all claims are allowable over the cited art and define an invention suitable for patent protection. The Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner enter the amendment, reconsider the application, and issue a Notice of Allowance in the next Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Joshua D. Isenberg/

Joshua D. Isenberg

Reg. No. 41,088

Patent Attorney

Date: November 20, 2007

JDI PATENT

809 Corporate Way

Fremont, CA 94539

tel.: (510) 668-0965

fax.: (510) 668-0239